



January 29, 2018

Woodford Creek Farms LLP
C/o Martha Steding
411 Lawler Street
Iowa Falls, Iowa 50126

SUBJECT: Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) Compliance Inspection for – 816,
County – Hardin, – Facility #64258

Dear Woodford Creek Farms LLP:

Attached is a copy of the report resulting from the Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) facility compliance inspection on January 10, 2018.

Your attention is directed to the requirements and recommendations portion of the report.

If you have any questions, or feel this report does not represent the conditions at your facility, please call me at 641/424-4073.

Sincerely,

Trent Lambert, Environmental Specialist Senior
trent.lambert@dnr.iowa.gov
Field Services and Compliance Bureau

c: -Stephen Pollard, U.S. EPA Region 7, WWPD/WENF (electronic)
-Ken Hessenius, AFO Enforcement Coordinator, FO#3 (electronic)

enc: -AFO Facility Inspection Report
-Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) Regulatory Status Form
-Desktop Assessment Form
-MMP Inspection Form

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

AFO INSPECTION REPORT

FACILITY DESCRIPTION

FACILITY LOCATION	Facility: 816			Facility ID#: 64258	
	Address: 18112 155th St.		City: Iowa Falls	State: IA	Zip: 50126
	PLSS: Section 33, Alden Township (T89N, R21W), Hardin County				
OWNER	Name: Woodford Creek Farms LLP				
	Address:		City:	State:	Zip:
ANIMAL HOUSING TYPE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Confinement <input type="checkbox"/> Open Lot <input type="checkbox"/> Combined (Confinement & Open Lot)				
ANIMAL INFORMATION	Animal Type(s)	Capacity	Current Head	Number of Bldgs./Pens	
	Wean/Finish Swine	4160-Head	4160	2	
	Date of Construction: 2006		Date of Expansion: N/A		

INSPECTION INFORMATION

INSPECTION DATE	This Inspection: January 10, 2018		Last Inspection: 05 AUG 08 - MMP/Site Insp.	
PERSONS INTERVIEWED	Name: Martha Steding		Title: Agronomist	
	Name: Todd Kjormoe		Title: Agronomy Technician	
	Name:		Title:	
NEAREST WATERCOURSE	Stream Name: Beaver Creek			
	Description of Flow Path: Overland and/or drainage tile flow to the northeast.			

COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

OBSERVATIONS	Nutrient Management: <input type="checkbox"/> CNMP <input type="checkbox"/> NMP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MMP <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> No formal plan			
	Manure Stockpiling: <input type="checkbox"/> In controlled area <input type="checkbox"/> In compliance with rules <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable – direct haul <input type="checkbox"/> Stockpiling in an uncontrolled area	Mortality Management: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rendering <input type="checkbox"/> Composting <input type="checkbox"/> Incineration <input type="checkbox"/> On-site burial <input type="checkbox"/> Landfill	Runoff from Feed Storage: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outdoor feed storage area <input type="checkbox"/> Discharge from feedstock storage area is controlled <input type="checkbox"/> Feed storage is located in an uncontrolled area	
	Clean Water Diverted: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Discharge to a Water of the U.S. via Manmade Conveyance: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Direct Animal Contact with Waters of the U.S.: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
	Adjacent Facilities (by same owner/operator): <input type="checkbox"/> Confinement <input type="checkbox"/> Open Lot <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None			
	Evidence of Discharges: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
	No evidence of current or past discharge observed at time of inspection.			
	NPDES PERMIT STATUS	The facility, as observed during the inspection, was a Large CAFO and did not need an NPDES permit. NPDES permit is required: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
COMPLIANCE STATUS	This facility appeared to be in compliance with Iowa's environmental regulations at the time of the inspection. Actual conditions may vary over time with the operation and maintenance of the facility. Facility is in compliance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
AUTHENTICATION	Inspector: Trent Lambert	Date: 29 JAN 18	Reviewer: Scott Wilson	Date:

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
AFO INSPECTION REPORT

FACILITY EVALUATION

Bio-Security

Prior to my inspection I discussed bio-security with Martha Steding, the facility representative. Mrs. Steding did not express a specific facility bio-security policy more restrictive than the Department's standard policy. Consequently, the Department's approved bio-security policy was followed. I was accompanied during the inspection by Mrs. Steding and Mr. Todd Kjormoe, both of Seaboard Foods of Iowa, the Management Company for Woodford Creek Farms.

Facility Description

This facility is comprised of two confinement buildings, each with a concrete, below-building pit serving as manure storage. The facility was originally constructed in 2006 under the authority of Construction Permit No. CP-A2006-018, and has not been expanded since. Feed is contained in bulk bins, and carcasses are rendered. There is no manure stockpiling or carcass composting on-site.



South side of north building – looking west



North side of south building – looking west

Manure Storage Structures

During the inspection, I walked the entire perimeter of both buildings. I observed that portion of the manure storage structure (pit) concrete which was visible above-ground. This amounted to approximately 2-feet of concrete, which would be above the slats covering the below-building deep pits. The observed concrete appeared to be structurally sound, as I observed no obvious evidence of cracking, excessive spalling or other issues of concern regarding the visible portion of the concrete. I did not observe any evidence of manure discharges either from or in the vicinity of the buildings.

I did observe a drainage tile observation port and associated shut-off valve located approximately 100-feet due north of the north confinement building, between the facility windbreak and the adjacent crop field. I could see some water in the tile, via the observation port. I did not detect any visual, olfactory or other indication of manure contamination in the tile. The presence of these structures documents compliance with both IAC 567 65.15(14) and Construction Permit Condition Nos. 4(d) and (e).

While no evidence of discharge was observed during this inspection, it is recommended that the manure storage structures be inspected for discharges and needed repairs regularly, as confinement feeding operations must contain all manure produced between periods of application. Additionally, any future discharges may require that an NPDES permit be obtained for the operation.



Drainage tile observation port (black) and shut-off (green)



Same – looking southeast toward north building

Feed System

During the inspection, I observed the bulk bin feed system serving each building. All bins, feed conveyance pipes and various attachments appeared to be intact and effectively containing feed. This part of the operation should be inspected frequently, as runoff water could carry spilled feed into a water course where it could create violations of state water quality standards. Discharge of such process water would potentially require an NPDES permit.



South building feed bins and piping



North building feed bins and piping

Well

The water well serving this facility is located up-gradient and approximately 140-feet to the southeast of the southeast corner of the south confinement building. The combination of distance and elevated position, in relation to the buildings, provides excellent protection of the well from possible contamination due to any discharge(s) of manure or contaminated process water.

Carcass Disposal

Currently, carcasses are collected on-site for rendering. There is a carcass collection enclosure (dead box) located to the north of the facility on the east side of the gravel drive. The dead box structure is located on packed gravel and the surrounding area is both flat and vegetated. I did not observe any tile intakes in the immediate vicinity of the dead box; and

I did not observe obvious evidence of contaminated runoff from the dead box or immediate area. Therefore, the dead box appears to be sited in a location with little potential to cause contaminated surface runoff to leave the facility.



Looking northwest from well to buildings



Dead box enclosure on north side of facility

Watercourse Evaluation/Tile Intakes

The surrounding topography is predominantly flat and prone to potholes. There is obviously field drainage tile in the surrounding cropped area, although I did not observe drainage tile surface intakes either on-site or in the general vicinity. Visual observation revealed the general site drainage would be predominantly to the northeast, toward Beaver Creek approximately 5500-feet away. Based upon the distance involved, and the lack of evidence of a discharge, visual observation of Beaver Creek was deemed unnecessary.

Manure Management Plan

In conjunction with the on-site facility inspection, the MMP and associated record keeping was reviewed. The MMP and associated land-application records were current and complete and the requisite P-Index soil sampling has been conducted as required. I did not observe any obvious deficiencies with regard to the MMP or associated records. It should be noted that the facility was purchased by Woodford Creek Farms in 2016, so only two seasons of manure application records were available during the current inspection. The next 4-year, updated P-Index MMP is due by March 1, 2020. Manure land-application was most recently conducted by Hand Nutrient Management (1404CMS). Consultation of the department's Manure Applicator Certification database verified that the manager and 16 employees currently hold valid certifications.

It should also be noted that Mrs. Steding and Mr. Kjormoe continue to work toward updating all applicable manure land-application easements and/or agreements, per both 567 IAC 65.17(8) and the January 2016 agreement between Seaboard Foods (management company for Woodford Creek Farms) and the IDNR. According to Mrs. Steding, having to work with absentee land owners has, in some cases, slowed the process; but the company continues to make progress regarding this matter. Additionally, the Commercial Fertilizer Statements of Intent, as applicable, continue to be updated as the aforementioned easements/agreements are updated.

Of particular note during the current MMP inspection is the matter of conspicuously low available Nitrogen content sample results from the manure pits at this facility. Observed sample results for fall 2017 were 23.9 and 30.8 (lbs./1000 gal); and for fall 2016 were 16.7 and 18.3. I questioned these results because the common Nitrogen content for a finishing facility, utilizing dry feeders and below-building pits would typically range between approximately 45-60 lbs./1000 gallons. Additionally, Iowa State University's recommended Nitrogen content, otherwise known as the "Book Value", for manure from a facility of this type is 50 lbs./1000 gallons. Mrs. Steding and Mr. Kjormoe expressed their supposition that the low values are likely due to the very liberal use of the building misters/soakers during the summer and fall. Excessive water loading in the pits would certainly dilute the overall nutrient content of the manure. With that said, the fall 2016 Nitrogen sample values are still very suspect; as they are at the low end of what would be the typical range for manure in uncovered manure storage structures, let alone covered pits.

It is strongly suggested that additional manure sampling be conducted. If subsequent samples are similarly low in nutrient content, then facility water management practices may need to be examined. If there is truly enough water dilution occurring to produce results as low as those from 2016, it could reasonably be expected that manure storage capacity could become an issue at some point.

SUMMARY

This facility is a Large CAFO, consisting of two swine finishing confinement buildings which were constructed in 2006 under the authority of Construction Permit CP-A2006-018. Manure storage is accomplished via two formed, concrete below-building pits. The visible portions of the manure storage structures appeared to be structurally sound, feed is contained in enclosed bins and conveyance tubes and carcasses are rendered off-site. There is no file history of historic spills or releases at this facility. I did not observe evidence of either current or past manure or process water discharges from this facility at the time of the inspection.

In conclusion, it is my determination, based upon my observations during this inspection and my pre-inspection file review, that this Large CAFO is a non-discharging facility; and an NPDES permit is not required for this facility at this time. At the conclusion of the inspection, the facility Regulatory Status determination was discussed with Mrs. Steding. She did not express any questions or concerns regarding my determination

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Inspect manure storage structures, carcass disposal areas and feeding system components on a frequent and regular basis as the discharge of pollutants from these areas could potentially require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.
- 2) Conduct additional manure sampling to determine if suspect low nitrogen content results are accurate and, if so, examine facility water management practices so that manure storage capacity does not become an issue.

REQUIREMENTS

- 1) Continue to update all applicable manure land-application easements and/or agreements, per 567 IAC 65.17(8), as soon as possible.

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
AFO INSPECTION REPORT

AERIAL PHOTOS OF: Woodford Creek Farms LLP - 816

DNR AFO Siting Atlas – 2015 NAIP



Bing Maps



IOWA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
AFO Desktop Assessment Form

Assessor:	Trent Lambert	Assessment Date:	28 DEC 17		
Documentation Examined:					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFO Siting Atlas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Facility File	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOCD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AFO Database		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MMP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Mapping Information Bing Maps, GISU LiDAR Mapping		<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____		
FACILITY LOCATION	FACILITY: 816		FACILITY ID#: 64258		
	ADDRESS: 18112 155th St.	CITY: Iowa Falls	STATE: IA ZIP: 50126		
	PLSS: Section 33, Alden Township (T89N, R21W), Hardin County				
OWNER	NAME: Woodford Creek Farms LLP				
	ADDRESS:	CITY:	STATE: ZIP:		
	WORK:	HOME:	CELL:		
	EMAIL:				
ANIMAL INFORMATION	ANIMAL TYPE(S)	CAPACITY	CURRENT HEAD	# OF PENS	# OF BUILDINGS
	Wean/Finish Swine	4160-Head	UNK	UNK	2
FACILITY TYPE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Confinement <input type="checkbox"/> Open Lot		<input type="checkbox"/> Combined		
STORAGE TYPE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liquid <input type="checkbox"/> Dry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Covered		<input type="checkbox"/> Uncovered	
STORAGE STRUCTURE TYPE	<input type="checkbox"/> Earthen Manure Storage Structure	#	<input type="checkbox"/> Anaerobic Lagoon		#
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Below Building Pit	# 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Aerobic Lagoon		#
	<input type="checkbox"/> Outside Concrete Pit	#	<input type="checkbox"/> Outside Stockpile		#
	<input type="checkbox"/> Slurry-store	#	<input type="checkbox"/> Covered Stockpile		#
	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown				
AFO/CAFO Status	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large CAFO [†]	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium AFO	<input type="checkbox"/> Small AFO		
	[†] All large CAFOs require an onsite inspection.				
NEAREST WATERCOURSE	Watercourse Name: Suspected to be the South Fork Iowa River (and/or tributaries of same)				
	Distance between facility and nearest watercourse:		<input type="checkbox"/> < ¼ mile ^{††}	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> > ¼ mile	
	Description of flow path(s) to watercourse: Overland or drainage south/southwest toward South Fork.				
	^{††} All medium combined or open lot AFOs within a ¼ mile of a watercourse and that drain towards that watercourse require an onsite inspection. All medium confinement AFOs that utilize uncovered manure/litter storage and are within a ¼ mile of a watercourse and that drain towards that watercourse require an onsite inspection.				
COMPLIANCE HISTORY	Has there been a discharge to a Water of the U.S. within the last 5 years?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ^{†††}		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	If yes, did the facility permanently remedy the cause of the discharge?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	^{†††} All medium confinement AFOs that have discharged to water of the U.S. within the last 5 years require an onsite inspection.				
	Has there been a significant release within the last 5 years?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	If yes, did the release present a significant threat of discharge?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes*	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	* All medium confinement AFOs that have had a significant release in the last 5 years and the release presented a significant threat of discharging to a water of the U.S. require an onsite inspection.				
	Have there been any complaint investigations?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	If yes, describe:				
	Has an onsite inspection been conducted at this facility since 11/1/11?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	If yes, was the inspection functionally equivalent to facility type specific SOP (i.e., confinement, open feedlot or combined)?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes**	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Inspection Date:		Describe:			
^{**} No onsite inspection is required if a functionally equivalent inspection has been performed since 11/1/11.					

RUNOFF ASSESSMENT	Is there evidence that manure, litter, or process wastewater is uncontrolled and/or unmanaged?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	If yes, describe: No evidence observed in aerial photography.			
	Are there tile intakes within 100 feet of the production area?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	If yes, describe: None observed in aerial photography.			
	Does the facility utilize uncovered/uncontrolled composting areas?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	If yes, describe: None observed in aerial photography.			
<u>Note: If assessor answered "Yes" to any of the questions in this section, then an onsite inspection should be performed.</u>				
	<p>Assessment Notes/Comments:</p> <p>Review of available aerial photography did not reveal any obvious signs of discharge/runoff from the facility. There appears to be a carcass collection area for rendering on the west side of the driveway on the north end of the facility site, but there does not appear to be any composting on-site. Consultation of LiDAR mapping suggested the most likely path of discharge toward a water source would be either overland or tile flow primarily to the south/southwest toward unnamed tributaries of, or the South Fork Iowa River itself, in excess of 6500-feet away. It is possible, however, that site drainage might instead go north/northeast, toward Beaver Creek, approximately 5500-feet to the northeast. There was no evidence of discharge(s) documented during a previous facility inspection conducted on 05 AUG 08. Nor was there other file evidence (e.g., spill reports, complaints, etc.) of any documented discharge(s) from the facility.</p> <p>The above being said, with an AUC of 1664, this facility is considered a Large CAFO. Per the IDNR/EPA Work Plan Agreement, all Large CAFOs must be inspected. Consequently, an on-site inspection of this facility will be conducted.</p>			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ONSITE INSPECTION REQUIRED.		<input type="checkbox"/> ONSITE INSPECTION <u>NOT</u> REQUIRED.	
AUTHENTICATION	INSPECTOR: Trent Lambert	DATE: 28 DEC 17	REVIEWER: Scott Wilson	DATE:
<u>Note: This assessment was based on the information available on the date of the assessment. Conditions at this facility could change.</u>				



Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) Regulatory Status

Facility Name: 816 Facility ID: 64258 County: Hardin

- ☐ Large CAFO – Discharging – NPDES Permit Required
- ☒ Large CAFO – No discharge – No NPDES Permit Required
- ☐ Large CAFO – Has NPDES Permit
- ☐ Medium CAFO – NPDES Permit Required
- ☐ Medium AFO – No NPDES Required
- ☐ Medium AFO – Has NPDES Permit
- ☐ Designated CAFO – NPDES Permit Required
- ☐ Small AFO – No NPDES Permit Required

This determination was made based on conditions and observations made at the time of the inspection on January 10, 2018. Please note that the regulatory status of the facility can change if conditions at the facility change or are different from those documented during the inspection.

Inspector: Trent Lambert Date: 10 JAN 18

Regulatory Definitions of Large CAFOs, Medium CAFOs, and Small CAFOs

These regulatory definitions are from the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), implementing the federal Clean Water Act.

A **Large CAFO** confines at least the number of animals described in the table below.

A **Medium CAFO** falls within the size range in the table below and either:

- “(A) Pollutants are discharged into waters of the United States through a man-made ditch, flushing system, or other similar man-made device; or
- (B) Pollutants are discharged directly into waters of the United States which originate outside of and pass over, across, or through the facility or otherwise come into direct contact with the animals confined in the operation.” 40 CFR 122.23(b)(6)(ii)

If an operation is found to be a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States, the permitting authority may designate a medium-sized facility as a CAFO as provided in 40 CFR 122.23(c).

A **Small CAFO** confines the number of animals listed in the table **and** has been designated as a CAFO by the permitting authority after determining that it is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States as provided in 40 CFR 122.23(c).

Animal Sector	Size Thresholds (number of animals)		
	Large CAFOs	Medium CAFOs	Small CAFOs
cattle or cow/calf pairs	1,000 or more	300 – 999	less than 300
mature dairy cattle	700 or more	200 – 699	less than 200
veal calves	1,000 or more	300 – 999	less than 300
swine (weighing over 55 pounds)	2,500 or more	750 -2,499	less than 750
swine (weighing less than 55 pounds)	10,000 or more	3,000 – 9,999	less than 3,000
horses	500 or more	150 – 499	less than 150
sheep or lambs	10,000 or more	3,000 – 9,999	less than 3,000
turkeys	55,000 or more	16,500 – 54,999	less than 16,500
chickens other than laying hens (other than a liquid manure handling system)	125,000 or more	37,500 – 124,999	less than 37,500
laying hens (other than a liquid manure handling system)	82,000 or more	25,000 – 81,999	less than 25,000



IOWA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
ENFORCEMENT CHECKLIST FOR AFO/CAFO INSPECTIONS

INSPECTION DESCRIPTION

Date of Inspection January 10, 2018
Facility Name 816 Facility ID# 64258
Facility Address 18112 155th St., Iowa Falls, IA
Inspector's Name Trent Lambert

INSPECTION FINDINGS

Narrative Description of Investigation (evidence of current violations; indicators of past violations; future concerns):

No evidence of current or past discharge observed at time of inspection.

- ☒ Photographs and/or Video
- ☐ Water Samples (upstream and downstream)
- ☒ Personal Interviews
- ☐ Other _____

ACTIONS FOLLOWING INSPECTION

- ☒ No further action taken – **No violation(s) observed.**
- ☐ Informal Meeting Date _____
- ☐ Letter of Inquiry Date _____
- ☐ Letter of Noncompliance Date _____
(Within 30 days of confirmation of Violation)
- ☐ Notice of Violation Letter Date _____
(Within 30 days of confirmation of Violation)

REFERRAL/NON-REFERRAL

- ☒ Non Referral; No referral warranted. Explanation:
No violation(s) observed.
- ☐ Referral; based on the following criteria:
 - ☐ Fish kill/acute water quality degradation
(Manure spills and/or discharges that result in destruction of aquatic life, including fish, are a top priority)
 - ☐ Serious water quality degradation
(Release of pollutants may result in degradation of an aquatic resource without an obvious fish kill, but the effect may be impaired use and enjoyment of the water resource or chronic pollution harming aquatic life)

- ☐ Discharges of pollutants to state waters not authorized by an NPDES permit
(This priority would include discharges from open feedlots or confinements to waters of the state, not authorized under conditions of an NPDES permit issued by the DNR. An impact on water quality is documented)
- ☐ Failure to obtain required NPDES permit
(A large CAFO, medium CAFO, or designated CAFO is found to have any documented discharge without, or in violation, of an NPDES permit)
- ☐ Unauthorized construction
(Construction of AFO/CAFO structures (including open feedlots) without, or contrary to, a permit or other required documentation is also a DNR priority. Proper compliance with AFO siting and construction requirements is essential elements of the AFO program, which helps keep pollutants out of streams)
- ☐ Significant violations of NPDES permit and/or conditions in the permit
(Violations of a significant nature and/or repeated violations of operating or reporting requirements)
- ☐ Failure to submit MMP updates
(MMPs are the cornerstone of the animal feeding program. The MMP helps ensure that any proposed or current confinement feeding operation over 500 animal units has adequate land to use the manure nutrients it produces)
- ☐ Failure to obtain proper manure application certification
(The manure applicator certification program is an important component of the AFO regulations. The program ensures that manure is transported and applied properly)
- ☐ Other _____

Date of Referral to Legal _____

**Contact Information Form**

Facility Name 816

Facility No. 64258 Facility County Hardin

Contact Name Martha Steding

Phone No. 641-648-5020

Explain the purpose and expected duration for the compliance inspection. Inform the contact person that the on-site compliance inspection will include:

1. Review of the facility and manure records for the last 5 years – Make sure these are complete, organized and easy to read.
2. Review of the current MMP, NMP or CNMP – Make sure that the plan is complete and up-to-date.
3. Site “walk around” – This includes an assessment of the buildings, manure storage structures, stockpiles, feed storage, animal mortality storage area, manure application equipment, etc.
4. Assistance – Time will be provided to address the producer’s questions and discussion items.

Table 1: Attempts to Contact Producer

Telephone Information	Date	Time	Comments
Attempt #1	03 JAN 18	1050	Scheduled Inspection
Attempt #2			
Attempt #3			
Site Visit (conduct inspection or leave door hanger)			
NOV Issued			

Table 2: Appointment Information

Date **January 10, 2018** Time **0900**

Meeting With **Martha Steding**

Meeting Place **Facility Site**

Biosecurity Policy Departmental ☒ Facility ☐ Explanation

Entered on Outlook Calendar ☒

1. DNR environmental specialists will utilize this form when attempting to set up an appointment with a producer to do an on-site compliance inspection. The DNR specialist will use the following procedure:
 - 1) Attempt to contact a producer three times within a two-week period, documenting each attempt in Table 1.
 - 2) If unable to contact the producer, on the third attempt the specialist will leave a message on the producer’s voice mail or answering machine, if available, giving the time and place for the compliance inspection.
 - 3) At the appointed time, the DNR specialist will travel to the site to meet with the producer and conduct the inspection.
 - 4) If no one is present at the site, the specialist will post a notice requesting that the producer contact the local DNR office.
 - 5) If all aforementioned attempts to make contact with the producer fail, an NOV and/or referral to legal services for formal enforcement action may result.